

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment amends claims 10, 21, and 24 and adds new claims 29-34. Support for the amendment and the new claims can be found throughout the specification. *See e.g.* page 7, lines 7-10. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 14, 17, 18, and 21-34 will be pending in the application with claims 17, 18, 27, and 28 being withdrawn.

Claims 10, 14, 24-26 are Directed to Statutory Subject Matter

The Examiner alleged that claims 10, 14 and 24-26 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 10 recites a system which is statutory subject matter. However, the Examiner alleged that a “system” can be interpreted as software *per se*. Although Applicant disagrees that the claimed system could be properly interpreted as software *per se*, the foregoing amendment to claim 10 is made to prevent such an interpretation.

Meyer Does Not Anticipate Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 14 and 21-26

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 14 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0212684 to Meyer et al. (“Meyer”). In the Examiner’s Response to Arguments, the Examiner cited to the database described by Meyer that stores the unique IDs for the remote devices and associates the unique IDs with configuration parameters used to configure the remote devices. As previously argued, Meyer does not describe that the intermediate server sends a unique ID identifying the intermediate server to the remote devices and requests that the end users relate the ID that they receive to the location where the ID was received or to other characteristics associated with the location or the end user. The unique ID cited by the Examiner identifies the remote devices, not the intermediate server. *See* Response filed November 17, 2008, pp. 7-12; Response filed October 19, 2007, pp. 10-12. Thus, it is submitted that Meyer does not describe the claimed invention.

Claim 10 recites that the central system maintains a database that associates each of the unique IDs with at least one geographic area served by the receiver unit associated with the unique ID. Independent claims 21 and 31 also recite maintaining a database that

associates each of the unique IDs with the at least one geographic area served by the receiver unit associated with the unique ID. Since Meyer describes a database that associates IDs for the remote devices with configuration parameters, but not a database that associates a unique ID for a receiver unit with the areas served by the receiver unit, Meyer does not describe the claimed invention.

Claims 14, 24-26, and 29 depend from claim 10, claims 5, 6, 22, 23, and 30 depend from claim 21, and claims 32-34 depend from claim 31. The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

As stated in the interview summary provided by the Examiner, amendments to the claims were discussed to overcome the outstanding rejections and place the claims in condition for allowance. The foregoing amendment is consistent with that discussion and it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and solicits a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799. The Commission is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes/

Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1100 Peachtree Street Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
(404) 815-6500